

provided to a viewer, or user. The user then can manipulate the list using a remote control unit to scroll through the list to display the desired viewing option. The user can then use the remote control unit to select the desired viewing option.

Applicants' list is displayed within a first control object on the display screen. At least three items are displayed in the control object, which may comprises less than all of the display screen or, alternatively, may extend between the borders of the screen. The items at the borders of the list are only partially displayed so that the user can instinctively recognize that additional list items exist beyond those displayed. No other indicators, such as arrows or scroll bars, signifying that additional list items exist beyond those list items displayed, are required in Applicants' invention. In Applicants' invention, the partial display of border items allows the user to intuitively determine that the list includes items in addition to those displayed without displaying any other visual indicator.

Summary of the Systems Described in *Fujitaka*, *Florin*, and *Young*

Fujitaka describes a control system for displaying characters and symbols incrementally in a single direction from a predetermined position on a display screen. *Fujitaka* shows characters that are only partially displayed, as shown in Figure 10. The system of *Fujitaka* displays characters that are automatically displayed incrementally based on control and timing circuitry, without any interaction from a viewer or user. In *Fujitaka* the apparent purpose of displaying characters incrementally is only for a pleasing visual effect. Unlike Applicants' invention, the characters in *Fujitaka* are not part of a list of alternatively selectable items nor are the characters scrollable in alternate directions by a user of an interactive network system. Also, none of the partially displayed characters in *Fujitaka* represent a selectable item that represents an alternative viewing choice in connection with an interactive network system. Nowhere in *Fujitaka* is user interaction with the display of characters discussed. Therefore, *Fujitaka* does not teach or suggest displaying a list of alternatively selectable items, representing alternative viewing choices

in connection with an interactive network system, that are scrollable and selectable based on user input to the system.

Florin describes a system that displays a list of items. However, each item in *Florin* is displayed in its entirety within the list and therefore no item is only partially displayed. The only indication provided to the user in the display to indicate that additional list items exist beyond those currently displayed are arrows, as shown in Figure 12. Therefore, nowhere in *Florin* is it taught or suggested that an item displayed at the border of the list may be displayed only partially.

Both *Young* references show a list of items in a two-dimensional grid. However, neither *Young* reference shows or describes the partial display of an item at a border of the two-dimensional grid.

Response to Art Rejections

Claims 1, 13, 19, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fujitaka*.

Response to the Rejection of Independent Claim 1

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the claimed method is used in connection with an interactive network system. Claim 1 has also been amended to include the step of displaying a list of at least three alternatively selectable items in a first control object, wherein each item displayed at the border of the control object is only partially displayed. Amended Claim 1 also includes the additional steps of scrolling through the list of items based on user input to the interactive network system. The step of accepting the selection of one of the items in the list based on user input has also been added to amended Claim 1.

With respect to independent Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that *Fujitaka* discloses a system for controlling the scrolling of a list of items across the screen. However, *Fujitaka*

describes the incremental display of individual characters, but such characters are not items because they do not represent selectable viewing options in connection with an interactive network system. Additionally, the system of *Fujitaka* does not discuss manual scrolling, by the user of an interactive network system, of items in a list in different directions, i.e., toward the beginning and end of the list.

In Applicants' invention, the alternatively selectable items in the list are not automatically incrementally displayed within the control object. The list is scrollable in either direction (either toward the front or back of the list) based only on appropriate user input, such as the manipulation of a remote control unit that is operatively connected to the interactive network system. *Fujitaka* merely describes the automatic incremental display of characters in a single direction across a display screen.

Unlike Applicants' invention as defined by Claim 1, *Fujitaka* does not describe, teach, or suggest a method used in connection with an interactive network system and does not describe (1) displaying a list comprising at least three alternatively selectable items in a first control object; (2) partially displaying items at the border of the control object; (3) scrolling through the list based on user input; or (4) accepting the selection of one of the items based on user input. Therefore, based on the absence of each of the above-described limitations, it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to perform the method of Applicants' invention as described in amended Claim 1, based solely on the *Fujitaka* reference.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 13

The Examiner has also rejected Claim 13, which depends from Claim 1, under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fujitaka*. In addition to including all of the limitations of amended Claim 1, Claim 13 also recites that the first control object extends to at least two borders of the display screen. In addition to failing to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1, *Fujitaka* does not teach or suggest a control object that extends between at least two

borders of the display screen. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 13 is allowable.

Response to the Rejections of Claims 19 and 31

The Examiner states that Claim 19 is considered substantively equivalent to Claim 1 and that Claim 31 is considered substantively equivalent to Claim 13. Therefore, for the reasons set forth above regarding the allowability of Claims 1 and 13, Applicant submits that Claims 19 and 31 are similarly allowable.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2-12, 15-18, 20-30, and 33-38 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fujitaka* in view of *Florin*.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 2

Claim 2 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 1 and also requires the display of a focus frame within the first control object that supplies a visual indication of user control of the list. The Examiner concedes that "*Fujitaka* does not explicitly state that a user of the system may select any one of the items off of the list, although this can be presumed. Otherwise, there would be no reason to scroll through a series of items." The Examiner, however, misinterprets *Fujitaka* because *Fujitaka* does not require, or even discuss, any user interaction or input. The system of *Fujitaka* includes control and timing circuitry to automatically control the incremental display of characters in a single direction across the display screen. The viewer of the *Fujitaka* display screen does not have any control or ability to control or scroll the display of characters on the screen.

Although *Florin* discloses a system that is used to scroll through a list of items, neither *Fujitaka* nor *Florin* describe the partial display of items at the borders of the list. Because the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 and the additional limitations of Claim 2, the cited references do not teach or suggest the method recited by Claim 2. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 2 is allowable.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 3

Claim 3 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 1 and Claim 2. Claim 3 also recites that the focus frame is displayed on one item in the first control object. Because the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1, Claim 2, and the additional limitation of Claim 3, the cited references do not teach or suggest the method recited by Claim 3. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 3 is allowable.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 4

Claim 4 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 1, Claim 2, and Claim 3. Claim 4 also requires that the visual indication of the focus frame includes an altered border surrounding the item in the list. The cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1, Claim 2, Claim 3, and the additional limitations of Claim 4. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 4 is allowable.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 5

Claim 5 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 1, Claim 2, and Claim 3. Claim 5 also requires that the visual indication of the focus frame includes displaying the item in a different color than surrounding items in the list. Because the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1, Claim 2, Claim 3, and the additional limitation of Claim 5, the cited references do not teach or suggest the method recited by Claim 5. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 5 is allowable.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 6

Claim 6 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 1, Claim 2, and Claim 3. Claim 6 also requires that the visual indication of the focus frame includes displaying graphics

associated with the item in the list. Applicants submit that Claim 6 is allowable because the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 and the additional limitations of Claims 2, 3, and 6.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 7

Claim 7 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 1, Claim 2, and Claim 3. Claim 7 also requires that the visual indication of the focus frame includes magnification of the item compared to surrounding items. Because the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 and the additional limitations of Claims 2, 3, and 7, the cited references do not teach or suggest the method recited by Claim 7. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 7 is allowable.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 8

Claim 8 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 1, Claim 2, and Claim 3. Claim 8 also recites that the items in the list can be scrolled through the focus frame. The cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 and the additional limitations of Claims 2, 3, and 8. Claim 8 is therefore allowable.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 9

Claim 9 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 1, Claim 2, Claim 3, and Claim 8. Claim 9 also requires that the focus frame include a visual indication that the items in the list can be scrolled through the focus frame in a specified direction. The Examiner states that Figure 18 of *Florin* shows an example of arrow appendages on a focus frame. However, the focus frame of Applicants' invention is positioned on one item in the list, as recited in Claim 3 which is one of the claims from which Claim 9 depends. The arrow appendages shown in Figure 18 of *Florin* are located on an object that is not positioned on one item in the list.

Because *Fujitaka* and *Florin* fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 and the additional limitations of Claims 2, 3, 8, and 9, the cited references do not teach or suggest the method recited by Claim 9. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 9 is allowable.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 10

Claim 10 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 1, Claim 2, Claim 3, Claim 8, and Claim 9. Claim 10 also requires that the focus frame include appended arrow tabs as an indication that the items in the list can be scrolled through the focus frame in a specified direction. As stated above with reference to Claim 9, Figure 18 of *Florin* only shows an example of arrow appendages on an object that is not positioned on one item in the list. Therefore, the arrow appendages in Figure 18 of *Florin* are not located on a focus frame as defined by the claims of Applicants' invention.

Because the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 and the additional limitations of Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, and 10, Applicants submit that Claim 10 is allowable.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 11

Claim 11 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 1, Claim 2, Claim 3, Claim 8, and Claim 9. Claim 11 also requires that the focus frame is static and remains in a constant position in the first control object. Because the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 and the additional limitations of Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, and 11, the cited references do not teach or suggest the method recited by Claim 11. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 11 is allowable.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 12

Claim 12 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 1, Claim 2, Claim 3, Claim 8, and Claim 9. Claim 12 also requires that the focus frame is dynamic and shifts relative to the first control object. Because the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 and the additional limitations of Claims 2, 3, 8, 9, and 12, the cited references do not teach or suggest the method recited by Claim 12. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 12 is allowable.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 15

Claim 15 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 1, Claim 2, and Claim 3. Claim 15 also requires scrolling the items in the list through the focus frame and selecting the item within the focus frame. Applicants submit that Claim 15 is allowable because the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 and the additional limitations of Claims 2, 3, and 15.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 16

Claim 16 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 1. Claim 16 also requires displaying a second and third control object, each being able to alternatively accept focus for controlling the scrolling of items in the list. Neither *Fujitaka* nor *Florin* teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 and the additional limitations of Claim 15. Therefore, the cited references do not teach or suggest the method recited by Claim 16 and Applicants submit that Claim 16 is allowable.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 17

Claim 17 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 1 and Claim 16. Claim 17 also requires that the second control object controls scrolling of items in a first direction and the

third control object controls scrolling of items in a second direction. The cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1, Claim 16, and the additional limitations of Claim 17. Applicants therefore submit that Claim 17 is allowable.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 18

Claim 18 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 1. Claim 18 also requires displaying a second control object that can accept focus for controlling the scrolling of items in each direction. Because neither *Fujitaka* nor *Florin* teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1 and the additional limitations of Claim 18, Applicants submit that Claim 18 is allowable.

Response to the Rejections of Claims 20-30 and 33-36

The Examiner states that Claims 20-30 are considered substantively equivalent to Claims 2-12. The Examiner also state that Claims 33-36 are considered substantively equivalent to Claims 15-18. For the same reasons discussed above for Claims 2-12 and Claims 15-18, Applicant submits that Claims 20-30 and 33-36 are similarly allowable.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 37

Claim 37 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 19 and Claim 34. Claim 37 also requires that focus can be moved between control objects by user manipulation of a remote control unit operatively connects to the interactive network system. Because neither *Fujitaka* nor *Florin* teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1, Claim 34, and the additional limitations of Claim 37, Applicants submit that Claim 37 is allowable.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 38

Claim 38 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 19 and Claim 36. Claim 38 also requires that focus can be moved between control objects by user manipulation of a remote control unit operatively connects to the interactive network system. Applicants submit that Claim 38 is allowable because neither of the cited references teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claim 1, Claim 36, and the additional limitations of Claim 38.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 14

The Examiner has rejected Claims 14 and 32 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Fujitaka* in view of *Florin* and further in view of *Young*.

Claim 14 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 1. Claim 14 also requires that the first control object display items in a two dimensional grid, wherein at least two items at two borders of the first control object are only partially displayed. As stated above, *Young* shows items displayed in a two dimensional grid. However, neither *Young*, *Fujitaka*, nor *Florin* teach or suggest the partial display of items at the borders of a list. Therefore, because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in independent Claim 1 and the additional limitations of Claim 14, Applicants submit that Claim 14 is allowable.

Response to the Rejection of Claim 32

Claim 32 includes all of the limitations of amended Claim 19. Claim 32 also requires that the first control object display items in a two dimensional grid, wherein at least two items at two borders of the first control object are only partially displayed. For the same reasons as stated above regarding Claim 14, Applicants submit that Claim 32 is allowable.

New Independent Claim 39

Applicants have added new independent Claim 39 directed toward a computer-readable medium on which is stored a program comprising instructions which, when executed by the computer, perform the steps identified in Claim 1. For the reasons set forth above supporting the patentability of Claim 1, Applicants submit that new independent Claim 31 is similarly allowable.

Applicants further submit that new dependent Claims 40-44, which depend from new independent Claim 39, are also allowable for the reasons set forth above supporting the patentability of dependent Claims 2, 4, 9, 14, and 16, respectively.

CONCLUSION

Because none of the references cited by the Examiner teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in Applicants' amended independent Claims 1 and 19, and new independent Claim 39, Applicants submit that such claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants further submit that all dependent claims depending from independent Claims 1, 19, and 39 are similarly in condition for allowance.

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Official Action mailed November 13, 1996. A check for \$132 made payable to the "Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks" is enclosed as the excess claims fee for the newly added claims. If the Examiner believes that any informalities remain in the case that can be addressed by Examiner's amendment, a telephone call to the undersigned at (404) 818-3700 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

William A. Hartselle

By: William A. Hartselle
Reg. No. 36,548

JONES & ASKEW
37th Floor
191 Peachtree Street, N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30303-1769
(404) 818-3700
Our Docket: 13237-1210